



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF:

Sir:

HAROLD VATER ET AL

SERIAL No.: 09/700,656

FILED: February 14, 2001

FOR: ACCESS-CONTROLLED DATA STORAGE

MEDIUM

GROUP ART UNIT: 2137

EXAMINER: Z. Davis

ATTY. REFERENCE: VATE3001/BEU

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

The below identified communication(s) or document(s) is(are) submitted in the above application or proceeding:		
☐ Declaration	□ Issue Fee	
☐ Priority Document	□ Check	
☐ Formal Drawings	☐ Application Data Sheet	
	■ Request for Reconsideration of Notice of	
	Panel Decision that Request for Pre-Appeal	
	Brief Review is Improper	
Please debit or credit Deposit Account Number 02-0200 for any deficiency or surplus in connection with this communication. A duplicate copy of this sheet is provided for use by the Deposit Account Branch.		
☐ Small Entity Status is claimed.		

23364 Customer Number

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

625 SLATERS LANE - FOURTH FLOOR ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22314

(703) 683-0500

DATE: _____ December 20, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Benjamin E. Urcia

Registration Number: 33,805





IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re U.S. Patent Application of:)	Group Art Unit: 2137
Harold VATER et al.	j _i	Examiner: Z. Davis
Serial Number: 09/700,656)	Attorney Docket: VATE3001bet
Filed: February 14, 2001)	Confirmation No.: 7577

For: Access-Controlled Data Storage Medium

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF NOTICE OF PANEL DECISION THAT REQUEST FOR PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REVIEW IS IMPROPER

Honorable Commissioner For Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA. 22313-1450

Sir:

Reconsideration of the holding that the Request for Pre-Appeal Brief review submitted on November 20, 2006, is improper is respectfully requested.

The holding was on the grounds that a proposed amendment was included with the Pre-Appeal Brief request. In reply, the Appellant respectfully submits that **NO PROPOSED AMENDMENTS WERE INCLUDED WITH THE REQUEST.**

Instead, the included listing of claims merely corrected a status identifier. The amendments in the listing were previously submitted on October 11, 2006 and approval for entry was indicated in an Advisory Action dated October 26, 2006. Thus, the Request for Pre-Appeal Brief review is of claims already in the application, and not of newly amended claims submitted with the request.

Calling a revised status identifier a "proposed amendment" for the purpose of denying a request for pre-appeal brief review is a bureaucratic action worthy of a Kafka novel, but is not justified by either the rules or policy. The revised listing could have been Serial Number 09/700,656

submitted before or after the request without affecting the request. It was submitted together

with the request in the interest of enabling the PTO to process the papers together, with the

assumption that the PTO would recognize that the claims were NOT being amended. To

make sure, the first page of the response stated that "the response does not include any

amendments."

The purpose of pre-appeal brief review is to correct errors by the PTO in the most

efficient manner. Of course, if amendments are made, then additional consideration is

required and it makes sense to deny the request. However, where the amendments were

previously submitted and approved for entry, and no proposed amendments are submitted

with the request, as is the case here, consideration of the request is appropriate.

Therefore, it is again respectfully requested that a Pre-Appeal Brief conference be

held, and that the outstanding rejection be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

By: BENJAMIN E. URCIA

Registration No. 33,805

Date: December 20, 2006

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor

Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Telephone: (703) 683-0500

NWB:S:\Producer\beu\Pending Q...Z\V\VATER 700656\non-compliant.wpd

2